THE FUTURE TRADITIONS FOUNDATION

Title of Article:

A Nuts & Bolts Application of The Basic Ombuds Model: an Academic Ombuds Office Study

Author:
Misa Kelly

Affiliation:
Future Traditions Foundation, Executive Director

Contact:
Mailing Address: 2911 La Combadura
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
Email: future.traditions@verizon.net

OUTLINE

I.O INTRODUCTION

II.O ILLUSTRATIVE USE: THE BASIC OMBUDS MODEL; THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA (UCSB), OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

III. O APPLICATION: SET OF OMBUDSING PRINCIPLES/CONSIDERATIONS

A. UCSB ombuds system/scheme history

B. How the Ombuds is Selected/Ombuds Qualifications

C. Resources and Size of Office

D. Structural Components

E. Functional Components of Ombudsing: Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary functions

F. The Roles of the Ombuds

G. Building Blocks of the Ombuds Practice

H. "Power" of the UCSB Campus Ombuds

I. Process of the UCSB Campus Ombuds

K. "Types" of complaints received

L. Annual reports, Case Studies, and other Tools

M. Professional organizations/educational forums

IV.O WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE

IV. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

A Nuts & Bolts Application of The Basic Ombuds Model: an Academic Ombuds Office Study

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The majority of ombuds and ombuds scholars look to Sweden as the originator of the ombuds institution and categorize this type of model as a “classical” ombuds model. In the late sixties and early seventies the institution spread all over the world and the ombuds institution was adopted in many different settings (a term coined as ombudsmania by scholar Stanley V. Anderson). The author has developed several new tools intended to aide and assist ombuds and ombuds scholars in playing a concentrated game of “Catch-up with Ombudsmania”. These tools are described in the works: The Basic Ombuds Model, The Nuts & Bolts of Ombuds Theory, and“Catch-up” with Ombudsmania: Expanding The Theoretical Base of Ombudsing: A Campus Ombuds Process, Part I.

II. ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATION: THE BASIC OMBUDS MODEL; THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA (UCSB), OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

- *Expanding the Theoretical Base: a Campus Ombuds Process* ventures into relatively unexplored territory through an in-depth analysis of a single Campus Ombuds Office ombuds process.
- The Basic Ombuds Model theory breaks the complexity of ombudsing systems/schemes down into four fundamental components: the complaint handler, the complainant and its associated "respondent", a moral/spiritual tenet, and an entity. The first four components are identified as elements that can be held ceteris paribus[1], and the fourth element is identified as the variant one uses as a foundation for studying the different forms of ombudsing systems/schemes. *The Basic Ombuds Model* can be likened to the bare bones of an ombudsing system/scheme. The Set of Basic Ombudsing Principles/Considerations comprises the elements that put the life and vitality into the model.

  Topics covered in the *Nuts & Bolts of Ombuds* Theory are summarized in the following table.

[1] The term ceteris paribus signifies "With all other factors or things remaining the same" (Dictionary.com, 2003). The term is utilized her to indicate that the Basic Ombuds Model has expressed existing ombuds theory in a new way that enables scholars to "hold constant" certain components while measuring/quantifying/qualifying how ombuds systems/schemes vary when considering the one fundamental component that differs between schemes. The subset of considerations to evaluate when studying the "garden variety" ombuds system/schemes is defined as The Set of Basic Ombudsing Principles/Considerations. The Set is defined in greater detail in "The Nuts & Bolts of Ombuds Theory" (Kelly, 2003).

TABLE ONE

The Nuts & Bolts of Ombuds Theory Subject Headings

- how to pronounce the word
- a basic definition of ombudsing, etymology, and history of the word
- ombuds history
- “types” and “categories” of ombuds
- primary, secondary, tertiary functions of ombudsing (new theory)
- roles of the ombuds
- the building blocks of an ombuds practice (essential characteristics and standards of practice),
- the “power” of the ombuds
- the “process” of the ombuds (new theory)
- the structural components of ombudsing
- policies, procedures, rules, and guidelines
- “types” of complaints received
- how the ombuds is selected (precedent set by the Swedish model utilized by some scholars to evaluate ombudsing systems/schemes)
- resources and size of office
- annual reports, case studies, and other tools

- protecting confidentiality, ombudsman privilege, model shield laws
- concepts from alternative dispute resolution: listening skills, "getting to yes",
- continuing education: mediation training, restorative justice training, ombuds conferences, ombudsman readings & resources, liters, professional organizations
- glossary of terms

To Read These Works links to the papers are provided below:

The Basic Ombuds Model

A Campus Ombuds Process

The Nuts & Bolts of Ombuds Theory

II. ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATION: THE BASIC OMBUDS MODEL; THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA (UCSB), OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

I. UCSB's BASIC OMBUDS MODEL

Following is an illustration of use of the Basic Ombuds Model drawn from an analysis of the campus ombuds office at UCSB. The Ombuds Office closed in January of 2004; hence the work also becomes an important historical document in that UCSB was one of the first UC's to establish an office and was pivotal in the founding of the first

professional ombuds organization, The California Caucus of College and University Ombuds.

This example represents the “small picture” of a campus ombuds office that exists as a part of, yet separate from the UCSB campus community, and surrounding Santa Barbara environs. This “small picture” of campus ombudsing is a part of the “larger picture” of campus ombudsing within the United States, which in turn is a part of the “bigger picture” of international campus ombudsing. Campus ombuds in turn are a part of the greater ombudsing community serving the many different sectors of society.

The Four Fundamental Components:

1) Complaint Handler

The UCSB Ombuds Office has three ombuds whose primary function is defined as **complaint handling**: the University Ombuds, the Associate Ombuds, and the Assistant Ombuds.

2) Complainant and the Associated Respondent, Source of the Problem/Complaint

The UCSB Ombuds Office serves the UCSB campus community **handling complaints** of the staff, student, and faculty

communities of UCSB. The complainants are the staff, student, and faculty of UCSB. The respondents are those that are affiliated with the complaint of the complainant

3) Moral/Spiritual/Ethical tenet

The UCSB Ombuds Guidelines state: “In resolving complaints ombuds advocate for a **fair process** rather than serving as an advocate for a particular individual or a particular outcome”. Additionally, the mission statement of the office articulates “the Ombuds serve as independent agents through which **institutional injustices can be rectified** and the **causes of those injustices alleviated**. ‘Fair processes and ‘rectifying institutional injustices’ represent the moral/spiritual/ethical tenets utilized by the UCSB Ombuds.

4) An institution:

The UCSB Ombuds office is affiliated with The University of California, Santa Barbara.

In a larger context UCSB exists in the Goleta/Santa Barbara region, with its specific social, political, cultural norms; is a part of the social, political, cultural norms of Southern California; which is a part of the social political cultural norms of the

United States. The UCSB Ombuds system/scheme is categorized in the academic ombudsing sector.

The above is an expression of an academic ombuds system/scheme in the simplest of terms. In order to more fully understand the system one must integrate existing theory into the model through use of *The Set of Ombudsing Principles/Considerations* (Nuts and bolts of Ombuds Theory).

II. APPLICATION: SET OF OMBUDSING PRINCIPLES/CONSIDERATIONS

A. UCSB ombuds system/scheme history

Obtaining histories of individual ombuds systems/schemes provides valuable information with regard to the dissemination of the ombuds concept. The UCSB Ombuds Office was established in 1970 by a sense motion of the Academic Senate. The office was established at a time of social unrest and was, in part, developed by request of members of the UCSB student body. Members of the UCSB community were familiar with the ombuds concept in that it had become a focus of study for several scholars working within the political science department. The models being studied at that time

by Stanley V. Anderson, Alan Wyner, and John Moore were “classical” and “executive” systems/schemes (Wyner 1973).

B. How the Ombuds is Selected/Ombuds Qualifications (precedent set by the Swedish model). In 1809, when Swedish King Gustavus Aldophus was dethroned, constitutional reform took place resulting in a new constitution "based on the principle of balance of power between King and Riksdag". The constitution allowed for the Ricksdag to elect a man of known legal ability and outstanding integrity to the office of JO ('High Ombudsman') (Swanstrom 2001). Although an ombuds institution had been in existence one hundred years prior, it is this particular system that became the model for many of the modern ombuds models and this initial decision has set a precedent for the ombuds industry as indicated in the American Bar Association’s (ABA) Standards of Practice. The ABA standards clearly indicate that:

> “An ombuds should be a person of recognized knowledge, judgment, objectivity, and integrity. The establishing entity should provide the ombuds with relevant education and the periodic updating of the ombud’s qualifications” (ABA)

Choosing individuals of integrity for the position of Ombuds is a tradition at UCSB. The first UCSB University Ombuds (Dr. Geoffrey Wallace, still employed), although not a man of “known” legal ability, was at the time known for his “outstanding integrity” and involvement in social/civil issues at a time of social unrest on the UCSB campus. A selection committee out of a pool of some 100 applicants chose Dr. Wallace.

The proposal adopted by a sense of motion on February 12, 1970 by the UCSB Academic Senate, Section D, states the following pertaining to the selection of the Ombuds:

“Appointment and removal of the Ombudsman will be by the Chancellor, Chairman of the Academic Senate, The Associated Students Legislative Council and the Graduate Students Association upon the recommendation of at least two-thirds vote of the Advisory Council. In addition, the recommendation for appointment against removal shall require at least one vote for the candidate from each of the constituent groups of the Advisory Council, namely students (meaning graduates and undergraduates together), faculty and

administration. Recruitment and selection of the Ombudsman by the Advisory Council shall be conducted in a manner that will assure public confidence in the independence, impartiality, integrity, and status of the Ombudsman." (Appendix B, February 12, 1970: Proposal to establish the Office of the Ombudsman, adopted as a sense motion of the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate).

Inquiring within the UCSB Human Resources department, UCSB Ombuds positions are viewed as staff positions. Selection is handled in the same fashion that other staff positions are handled. Open positions are advertised in profession journals. The Chancellor's office appoints a search committee and open positions are chosen from a pool of qualified candidates as defined above.

C. Resources and Size of Office

The UCSB Ombuds Office is presently funded for a full-time *University Ombuds* position, an *Associate Ombuds* at 60% time, and a full-time *Assistant to the Ombuds* position (which is currently classified as 30% *Assistant Ombuds,* and 70% *Assistant to the Ombuds*) The four room office is located in the "Student Affairs and Administrative Building" and is fully equipped with the necessary equipment to effectively

manage an ombuds office (computers, printers, fax machine, copier machine, filing systems, storage, furniture, etc.). In addition to budget for staff the office has a modest budget that covers supplies and expenses, work-study student assistance, and some funding for travel, training, and research.

D. Structural Components

As previously indicated, The UCSB Ombuds Office was established in 1970 by a sense motion of the Academic Senate. The office is accountable to the Ombuds Advisory Committee. The UCSB Ombuds Statute defines the Ombuds Advisory Council as follows:

"There is established a committee of seven members to advise the Ombudsman, at his discretion. This committee will have two members appointed by the Academic Senate, one of whom should be non-tenure, two members selected by the Administration, and three student members of which two will be appointed by the Associated Students and one by the Graduate Students Association". The Ombuds Advisory Committee advises the University Ombudsman at his/her discretion. Additionally, as previously stated, the Ombuds Advisory Committee makes recommendations for appointment and

against removal of the University Ombuds. The University Ombuds meets bi-annually with the Executive Vice Chancellor to discuss office activities. The Executive Vice Chancellor approves the UCSB Ombuds office budget changes, and authorizes travel requests. The organization chart associated with the Ombuds office can be viewed online at the following site: <http://www.evc.ucsb.edu/evc/org_chart/> (11 July 2003).

Current classification of positions held in the office include:

University Ombuds as "University Ombuds" (100%)

Associate Ombuds as "Student Affairs Officer V" (60%)

Assistant Ombuds as "Student Affairs Officer II" (30%)

Assistant to the Ombuds as "Administrative Assistant I" (70%)

A more complete structural analysis would include "job descriptions". In that the UCSB ombuds job descriptions are quite lengthy, and detailed, it is beyond the scope of this paper to present job descriptions within this work.

Borrowing from the work of Larry Hill, structural characteristics that the UCSB Ombuds Office shares with the classical model include:

> "Being a functional autonomous separate entity,
>
> Monitoring specialist,
>
> Administrative experts and professionals,
>
> Non-partisan,
>
> Client-centered but not anti-administration,
>
> Popularly accessible and visible,
>
> High status institution,
>
> Have resources extensive enough to perform their mission" (Hill, 1997)

Although not structurally independent, the UCSB Ombuds Statute requires that "recruitment and selection of the Ombudsman by the Advisory Council be conducted in a manner that will assure public confidence in the **independence**, impartiality, integrity, and status of the Ombudsman." thereby defining functional independence.

The mission of the UCSB Ombuds office is stated as follows:

“USB’s Ombuds serve as independent agents to improve the communication between individuals and the institution, and to provide avenues through which possible institutional injustices can be rectified and the causes of those injustices alleviated. More specifically, this includes receiving complaints, investigating and taking appropriate action (e.g., counseling, negotiating, and persuading). In such ways, the Ombuds assist in making the institution less impersonal, more equitable and flexible, and help the individual find a significant role in relation to it. The Ombuds Office serves the entire University population it is available to students, staff, and faculty. The functions of the Office are (1) to redress individual grievances and complaints; (2) to prevent recurrence of patterns of complaints; (3) to increase responsiveness of the institution; (4) to protect officers of instruction and administration from unfounded complaints; (5) to identify undesirable procedures and practices; (6) to relieve complaint-handling burden from other agencies; and (7) to educate and inform about the nature of higher education.”

The UCSB Ombuds Office is made visible by the following means:

- Sexual Harassment Policy

"Many complaints of alleged sexual harassment may be satisfactorily handled through such channels as the work supervisor, the chair of an academic department, the dean of a college, The Employee Relations Officer, an **Ombudsman**, the Affirmative Action Coordinator, the Student discrimination officer in the Office of the Vice Chancellor Student Affairs, and Designated Contact Persons" (University of California, Santa Barbara, 1993).

- Faculty Code of Conduct

"Informal complaints of violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct may be received by the following Campus officers: for any complaint, the chair of the relevant department, the dean or provost of the relevant college, and the **Office of the Ombudsman**…" (UCSB Academic Senate, 1988).

- Description of the office in written literature, and on websites including, but not limited to:

  Class schedules,

  UCSB Campus Directory,

  Ombuds Office Website,

  UCSB General Catalog,

UCSB Gauchonet website, “Counseling Services” listing,

UCSB College of Letters and Science website, “Sources of College Advice and Support” listing,

UCSB Human Resources website, “Campus Programs” listings,

UCSB in the Community website,

UCSB A-Z directory webpage,

UCSB Grad Division website, “Helping Hands” listing

UCSB Student Handbook, “Diversity Resources and Services” listing

UCSB Graduate Student Association website, “Campus Committees” listing

E. Functional Components of Ombudsing: Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary functions

Primary and Secondary Functions are ombudsing functions associated with the entity served. Primary functions are functions that are commonly found in the greater ombudsing community, such as complaint handling, creation of annual reports/updates, and creation of case studies. Secondary functions are the results of the evolutionary process of the ombudsing concept. The expansion of the

basic function if complaint handling that results when the clay of the ombuds concept is pressed into a particular institutional mold, as well as the response to advances in the field of conflict resolution/management, and alternative dispute resolution. Tertiary Ombuds Functions are ombudsing functions associated with activity outside of the entity served, and are also associated with the evolution of the modern ombuds concept.

A. UCSB Ombuds primary functions include:

- Independent agents providing, informal, confidential, impartial complaint handling services.
- preparation of reports, case studies; recommendations

B. UCSB Ombuds secondary functions include:

- creation, direction, facilitation of The Campus Conciliation Council:

  “The Campus Conciliation Council (CCC) is comprised of approximately 40 members of the UCSB campus community that provide services to reduce or resolve conflict (mediation, counseling, conflict resolution skills training, ombudsing, restorative justice, facilitation,

law). The group meets quarterly to discuss respective programs, new developments, changes within existing programs, resource availability, educational opportunities, and advances in the field of conflict resolution" (Kelly, 2002)

- participation in the UCSB Restorative Justice Project
- revitalization of the UCSB Ombuds Mediation Program

C. UCSB Ombuds tertiary functions include:

- Conducting research, and writing for the California Caucus of College and University Ombuds (CCCUO) Journal, as well as other professional publications.
- Convening, co-convening, participation in the annual CCCUO conference
- Ombuds research projects, and expansion of UCSB ombuds office website as an educational resource for the general public.

F. The Roles of the Ombuds

The UCSB Campus Ombuds play many roles while fulfilling their primary, secondary, and tertiary functions. Roles are representative of the many different hats an ombuds wears in

the course of carrying out his/her day to day ombuds functions. These campus ombuds roles have been written about and identified by Marsha Wagner, Tom Sebok, and Stanley V. Anderson. Some of these roles include: coach, mediator, counselor/therapist, educator, change agent, reformer, remedial role, playing field leveler, information disseminator, exculpatory, and investigator. For the UCSB Ombuds Office I would add the roles of restorative justice coordinator/facilitator, fair process/ethic/justice advocate, social worker, system glitch plumber, crisis coordinator, conference organizer, conference educator, role model/mentor, facilitator, supervisor, researcher, legal process educator, reasoned persuader, "safe/comfort space" designer, and visionary.

G. Building Blocks of the Ombuds Practice

The work of ombuds scholars, ombuds practitioners, and the American Bar Association has resulted in the creation of "essential characteristics" and "Standards of Practice" for Ombuds. Within these works the *Building Blocks* of the UCSB Campus Ombuds. These *Building Blocks* create the cornerstones of the UCSB campus ombuds practice.

In an abbreviated form, the cornerstones include:

- Informality
- Impartiality
- Confidentiality
- Independence
- Advocate for Fair/ethical/just processes/outcomes/solutions

Existing Standards of Practice include:

The American Bar Association Section of Administration Law and Regulatory Practice Section of Business Law Section of Dispute Resolution

Standards of Practice

http://www.abanet.org/adminlaw/ombuds/2003_proposed_standards.doc

University and College Ombuds Association (UCOA)

Standards of Practice

http://www.colorado.edu/Ombuds/UCOA/SOP.html

(14 Feb. 2003)

The Ombuds Association (TOA)

Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice

http://www.ombuds-toa.org/code_of_ethics.htm (14 Feb. 2003)

United States Ombudsman Association (USOA)

Draft Governmental Ombudsman Standards

http://www.usombudsman.org/DraftSTANDARDS.doc

H. "Power" of the UCSB Campus Ombuds

UCSB Ombuds have the power to investigate, use the power of reasoned persuasion, and can employ the power of publication to give criticism, or make recommendations in the Ombuds Office Reports/Updates.

I. Process of the UCSB Campus Ombuds

Following are the steps that have been identified in the Campus Ombuds Process that will become the foundation for further research. The process is more fully articulated in the author's

work “A Campus Ombuds Process” (Kelly, 2002). The components of the process identified include:

Initial contact

Log in of client

Intake interview

Client preparation

Ombuds preparation

First meeting

Confidentiality agreement

Information gathering

Support and feedback

Education

Brainstorming

Clarification of client goals

Strategy development

Implementation

Ombuds steps

Client steps

Conflict/problem/complaint resolved

Closure

Follow-up

Thank-you

Reflection

Files destroyed.

It is important to note that the UCSB Campus Ombuds Process is not necessarily a linear process with each complainant going through the steps of the process from beginning to end. In addition, the complainant might exit the process after initial contact, or at many other steps within the process (Kelly 2003).

J. Policies, procedures, rules, and guidelines associated with the model

In the course of complaint handling the following UC policies, rules, guidelines have been an integral part in the complaint handling process.

- UCSB Sexual Harassment Policy
- UCSB Academic Senate Faculty Code of Conduct
- UCSB policies, procedures, guidelines for formal grievance processes
- Academic Dishonesty Policy

- Student Disciplinary Policy
- UCSB College of Letters and Science petitions: adding and dropping classes, retroactive ads, retroactive withdrawals, etc.
- UCSB Teaching Assistant Rights and Resources
- UCSB Campus Regulations Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students
- UCSB Human Resources Personnel Policies for Staff Members
- UCSB Academic Personnel Procedures
- UC University Wide Policies and Procedures
- University of California Policies Pertaining to Research
- Whistleblower Protection Policy
- Union Contracts
- UCSB Care Team: Values of Our Community (informal civility document)

In addition, in the course of complaint handling, our office provides education with regard to certain legal processes/rights by apprising complainants of pertinent literature. Some of these items include:

- Small Claims Court Procedures
- Information pertaining to Court Processes in relation to criminal/traffic charges (DUI, misdemeanors, battery, theft, drunk in public, disturbing the peace, other)
- Landlord/Tenant Rights
- Habitability Repair and Deduct Procedures

K. "Types" of complaints received

Following is a list of some of the different types of complaints handled by the UCSB Ombuds office. Complainant community categorizes the complaint types. In order to more fully illustrate complaint types associated case studies would need to be created. The UCSB Ombuds has found that although complaints might be of similar types, each case is so unique that they seem one of a kind.

Students

- grade disputes
- academic misconduct
- landlord/tenant relations
- professor/student relations
- student/teaching assistant relations

- faculty code of conduct violations
- disability issues
- crisis management
- accidents/personal injury
- administrative glitches
- student/student relations
- sexual harassment
- restorative justice process
- law enforcement
- graduate student concerns (intellectual property rights, publication issues, advisor/student relations, graduate student attrition rates, etc)
- discrimination based on race, sex, disability, race, age, religion, sexual orientation

Staff

- Disciplinary actions
- management/employee relations
- changes in departmental structure, rules, policies
- bullying & harassment
- promotion/demotion
- reclassification

- work environment
- discrimination
- disability issues

Faculty

- tenure and promotion issues
- disciplinary actions
- violation of the faculty code of conduct
- intradepartmental conflicts
- management service officer/faculty relations
- faculty/undergraduate student relations
- faculty/graduate student relations
- intellectual property rights
- publication issues
- discrimination

L. Annual reports, Case Studies, and other Tools

In the past the UCSB Ombuds office has developed reports, and like many campus ombuds, has not created case studies, redacted for confidentiality for use in reports. The office is presently revitalizing the creation and use of reports in form of Ombuds Office Updates. In addition, the office will begin to

create case studies for use in Ombuds Office Updates, for presentation at professional conferences, and to contribute to the Ombuds Case Study Project.

M. Professional organizations/educational forums

The UCSB Ombuds Office is most closely affiliated with the California Caucus of College and University Ombuds (CCCUO) in that the University Ombuds, Dr. Geoffrey Wallace, is one of the co-founders of this organization. Office Ombuds are active participants in CCCUO activities including participation, convening, and presentation at the annual CCCUO conference, as well as writing for the CCCUO professional ombuds journal. Additionally, Dr. Geoffrey Wallace has been a mentor to many ombuds over the course of 34-year tenure at UCSB. Budget as well as time constraints do not allow UCSB Ombuds to participate in more than one conference per year; hence, the office is not actively involved in conferences offered by other professional ombuds organizations. However, communication through Listservs associated with other professional ombuds organizations enable UCSB Ombuds to receive (and give) guidance, support, and feedback to ombuds that are actively

involved in professional organizations other than CCCUO. Ombudsing system/scheme involvement in professional organizations provides valuable assessment information. Networking, mentoring, resource provision, and educational opportunities, provided by professional ombuds organization play an important role in informing the ombuds practice. In turn the “process”, “role”, “function”, and “building blocks” components of an ombudsing system/scheme could be affected. Our office has provided information to several organizations seeking to develop campus ombuds offices, which might influence the structural component of the ombudsing system/scheme.

CONCLUSION: TAKING THE STUDY TO THE NEXT LEVEL

It is the author’s opinion, that through use of the ***Basic Ombuds Model,*** and ***The Set of Ombudsing Consideration/Principles,*** in-depth analyses can be created that will serve to advance the understanding of the ombuds institution. In particular, how the clay

of the ombuds concept, when pressed against varied institutional forms, results in variations on the ombudsing theme. Not to say that all ombuds offices evolved from this model, but that not all models share the same attributes. Understanding the evolution, the similarities, the differences will provide the information necessary to build upon the foundation of existing ombuds educational resources and take the understanding to a new level.

Following are some organizational ideas for launching further research in this area.

In order to carry out such a study the author suggests organizing ombuds offices by “entity type” which are then organized into sectors.

An inventory taken of existing “types” of ombuds uncovering approximately 45 different uses of the title ombuds in relation to an organization. These “types” have been organized as groupings of similar types of institutions into sectors. The sectors are organized as follows.

Ombuds Sector Categories[2] include:

Academic (AC)

Business/Corporate (BUS)

Government (GOV)

Communications (COM)

Law Enforcement/Homeland Security (LE/HS)

Health Care (includes long term care) (HC)

Special Interests or One of a Kind. (SI)

The following table provides a visual of the process.

SECTOR	CL	AC	BUS	GOV	COM	LE/HS	HC	SPEC
Four Components								
Cultural Container								
History								
Ombuds Selection								
Office Size/Resources								
Functions								

[2] These sector categories were created as a by-product of research associated with the history of ombuds categorization.

Structure								
Roles								
Building Blocks								
“Power”								
“Process”								
Policies, Procedures, Rules,								
Complaint Types								
Annual reports, case studies, and other tools								
professional organizations/ educational forums								
Miscellaneous								

Academic (AC) Business/Corporate (BUS) Government (GOV) Communications (COM) Law Enforcement/Homeland Security (LE/HS) Health Care (includes long term care) (HC) Special Interests, or One of a Kind. (SI)

An in-depth analysis of ombuds diversification, such as the one illustrated in this work, would begin with conducting single studies of a single ombuds systems/schemes from each sector. The information

gathered would help to develop the research systems necessary to conduct studies that span across entire sectors of ombudsing. From this information, educational materials could be developed suitable for varied educational settings.

It is the author's opinion, that an understanding of ombuds theory enables an ombuds to realize his/her fullest potential as a peacemaker working in the field of ombudsing. The author invites ombuds, and ombuds scholars, to utilize these ideas as a focus for personal studies, topics of consideration in professional ombuds conferences, and for graduate students interested in the concept to feel free to "steal a few ideas" in the interest of furthering the field of ombudsing.

The following table provides a visual of the process.

SECTOR	CL	AC	BUS	GOV	COM	LE/HS	HC	SPEC
Four Components								
Cultural Container								
History								
Ombuds Selection								
Office Size/Resources								
Functions								
Structure								
Roles								
Building Blocks								
“Power”								
“Process”								
Policies, Procedures, Rules,								

Complaint Types								
Annual reports, case studies, and other tools								
professional organizations/ educational forums								
Miscellaneous								

Academic (AC) Business/Corporate (BUS) Government (GOV) Communications (COM) Law Enforcement/Homeland Security (LE/HS) Health Care (includes long term care) (HC) Special Interests, or One of a Kind. (SI)

REFERENCES

Al- Wahab, I. I. 1979. *The Swedish institution of ombudsman: an instrument of human rights.* Stockholm : LiberFörlag.

American Bar Association, Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice, Section of Business Law. 2001. *Report to the House of Delegates. Standards for The Establishment and Operation of Ombuds Offices* <http://www.ombuds-toa.org/downloads/ApprABAStand.doc> (14 September 2002)

American Bar Association, Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice, Section of Business Law. 2003. *Report to the House of Delegates. Draft Revised Standards for The Establishment and Operation of Ombuds Offices.* <http://www.abanet.org/adminlaw/ombuds/2003_proposed_standards.doc> (2 July 2003)

Anderson, S.V. 1969. *Ombudsman Papers: American Experience and Proposals*. Institute of Governmental Studies University of California, Berkeley. <http://www.sa.ucsb.edu/ombuds/StanleyVAnderson/AndersonArticles.asp> (28 Sep. 03)

Anderson, S.V. 1973. Comparing Classical and Executive Ombudsmen. In *Executive Ombudsmen in the United States*, edited by Alan J. Wyner. University of California Berkely, Institute of Government Studies: Ombudsman Activities Project. 305-315.

Anderson, S. V. 1981. *Ombudsman Readings*. Edmonton, AB: International Ombudsman Institute.

Anderson, S. V. 2001. Ombudscholars *California Caucus of College and University Ombuds: The Journal.* (3) 1: 1-5. <http://www.sa.ucsb.edu/ombuds/paper2.html> (2 July 2003).

Anderson, S. V. 2002. “Basic Ombuds Model” 12 December 2002. Email correspondence. (11 July 2003).

Anderson, S.V. 2003. “Ombudsmania Origin” 25 July 2003. Email correspondence. (28 Sep. 2003).

Apollos, F. M., and A. A. Yakuba (1999) *Revitalizing Traditional African Approaches to Peacebuilding and Reconciliation during Armed Conflicts.* Unitar Presentation. 12 November 1999. <http://www.africanprinciples.org/documents/afi_apollos_panel_discussion_on_peace.doc> (9 Oct. 2003)

Baruch, G. , Folger J. P. 1994. *The Promise of Mediation: Responding to Conflict Through Empowerment and Recognition.* Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.

Bauer, F. 2000. The Practice of One Ombudsman. *Negotiation Journal* 16(1): 57-79.

Björkman, M. 1998. *Charles goes to Turkey.* Website publication. <http://www.utb.boras.se/uk/se/projekt/history/articles/decline/decline6.htm> (23 August 2002).

Caiden, G.E., MacDermot, N., and A. Sandler. 1983. The Institution of the Ombudsman. In *The International Handbook of the Ombudsman,* edited by G.E. Caiden, 3-22. Westport Conn., Greenwood Press.

CPR . *The ABCs of ADR: A Dispute Resolution Glossary,* November 1995. <http://www.cpradr.org/glossary.htm> (6 December 2002)

Deacon, T. 1997. *The Symbolic Species.* Allen Lane: The Penguin Press: London.

Dictionary.com. 2003. *Definition of Ethics.* <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=ethicMoral> (3 July 2003).

Dictionary.com. 2003. *Definition of Quasi* <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=quasi> (11 July 2003).

Dictionary.com. 2003. *Definition of Ceteris Paribus* <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=ceteris%20paribus> (28 Sep. 2003).

Dunbar, R. 1996. *Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language.* London: Faber and Faber. <http://www.sciencebookguide.com/book.html?book=32> (3 July 2003).

Echoes in Time. 2000. *Y'ALO The DECISION MAKER TOP Dispute Resolution, Headhunter Style.* Echoes in Time website publication. <http://www.echoesintime.com/stories/NTGE001.htm> (10 Oct. 2003)

Elkins-Elliot, K. (2003) *We Don't Need a Mediator.* <http://www.txmediator.org/tools/WE%20DON.htm> (10 Oct. 2003)

Encyclopedia Brittanica: Online. 2003. *Definition of Ethics.* <http://www.britannica.com/search?query=ethics&ct=&fuzzy=N> (8 July 2003).

Farrell-Donaldson, M.D. 1993. *Will the Real Ombudsman Come Forward?* The Ombudsman: Diversity and Development, L. Reif, M. Marshall & c. Ferris, eds., 37-66.

Fergueson, M. 2002. *Preserving the Privilege of Confidentiality* United States Ombudsman Association: Newsletter <http://www.usombudsman.org/ServicesActivities/newsletter.htm > (4 September 2002).

Ferris, C.; Goodman, B.; and G. Mayer. 1980. *Brief on the Office of the Ombudsman.* International Ombudsman Institute Occasional Paper #6.

Fisher, P. 2000. *Changes in mediation.* Mediate.Com. <http://www.mediate.com/articles/fisher1.cfm> (4 Sep. 2002).

Fisher, R., and W. Ury. 1983. *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. (2nd ed.). New York: Penguin Books.

Frank, B. 1975. The Ombudsman – Revisited *International Bar Journal* May 1975 (48-59).

Gadline, H. 2000. The Ombudsman: What's in a Name? *Negotiation Journal* 16(1): 37-48.

Gadway, I. 1986. *The university ombudsman: 100 cases* (legitimation, Max Weber). (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 2871A.

Gellhorn, W. 1966. *When Americans Complain Governmental Grievance Procedures.* Harvard University Press.

Gottehrer, D. M. "presentation" *International Update*. The Second Ombudsman Leadership Forum Conference. San Francisco, California, June 10, 2000. <http://www.usombudsman.org/International_UpdateD_Gottehrer.pdf> (23 August 2002).

Hackett J. R. 1996. *Walter Gellhorn, Law Authority, Is Dead at 89.* Columbia University Record -- January 19, 1996 -- Vol. 21, No. 13 <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/record/archives/vol21/vol21_iss13/record2113.35.html> (1 July 2003).

Hasenfeld, H. 1995. The Ombudsperson as Change Agent. *California Caucus of College and University Ombudsman. UCI Ombudsman: The Journal.* <http://www.ombuds.uci.edu/JOURNALS/1995/ombudsperson.html> (11 September 2002).

Hill, L.B. 1974. Institutionalization, the Ombudsman, and Bureaucracy. *The American Political Science Review 68* (September 1974): 1075–1085.

Hill, L.B. 1997. "presentation*" American Ombudsmen and Others; or, American Ombudsmen and 'Wannabe' Ombudsmen* <http://www.abanet.org/adminlaw/ombuds/wannabe.html> (28 August 2002).

Hill. L.B. 2001. *Letter to Ms. Martha W. Barnett President, American Bar Association*. 20 July 2001. <http://www.usombudsman.org/ABA/Hill.doc> (13 September 2002).

Holmboe, M. 2001. "speech" *The Norwegian Ombudsman.* 2 June 2001 <http://www.nmr.lv/eng/news/docs/speech_Norwegian_ombudsman_office.doc> (12 Sep. 2002).

Huna.com. "What is Huna" <http://www.huna.com/ho-oponopono.html> (15 July 2003).

International Ombudsman Institute Newsletter Volume 24: Number 2 June 2002 <http://www.law.ualberta.ca/centres/ioi/eng/newsletters/v24n4/ioi_v24n4_e.html> (7 July 2003).

Kelly, M. 2002. Reflections of a Budding Ombuds: The First Two Years. *The California Caucus of College and University Ombuds: The Journal.* 4(1): November 2002, 41-60).

Kelly, M. 2002. *A Campus Ombuds Process*. Work-in-progress paper, pending publication.

Kelly, M. 2003. *Catch-up with Ombudsmania: Expanding The Theoretical Base.* Work-in-progress paper, pending publication.

Kelly, M. 2003. *The Case Study Project.* Website publication. <http://www.sa.ucsb.edu/ombuds/officeprojects/OmbudsCaseStudyProject.asp> (9 Oct. 2003).

Kelly, M. 2003. *The Ombuds Oral History Project.* Website publication.

<http://www.sa.ucsb.edu/ombuds/officeprojects/OmbudsOralHistory.asp> (9 Oct. 2003).

Kelly, M. 2003. *The Ombudsman's Reading and Resource Room.* Website publication.

<http://www.sa.ucsb.edu/ombuds/ResourcesWeblinks/Reading&ResourceRoom/index.asp> (9 Oct. 2003).

Kelly, M. 2003. *The Ombudsman's Annual Report Project.* Website Publication.

<http://www.sa.ucsb.edu/ombuds/officeprojects/AnnualReportProject.asp> (9 Oct. 2003).

Kelly, M. 2003. A Composite Campus Ombuds Profile. *Conflict Management In Higher Education Report. Volume 4, Number 1, Oct. 2003.*
<http://www.campus-adr.org/CMHER/ReportArticles/Edition4_1/kelly4_1a.html> (9 Oct. 2003).

Pakwatan.com. 2000. Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Judiciary. *Wafaqi Mohtasib* (Ombudsman)
<http://www.pakwatan.com/main/government/judiciary.php3> (8 July 2003).

Jacoby, A.. 2003. The Organization of Newspaper Ombudsmen: website publication. "Articles About Ombudsmanship". *News Ombudsmanship: Its History and Rationale.*
<http://www.newsombudsmen.org/jacoby.html> (1 July 2003).

Kirchheiner, H.H. 1983. The Ideological Foundation of the Ombusman Institution in *The International Handbook of the Ombudsman,* edited by Caien, G.E. (23-26) Greenwood Press, London.

Kropotkin, P. 1998. *Ethics: Origin and Development.* St Augustine's Press, Inc.
<http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/kropotkin/ethics/ch4.html> (3 July 2003).

LeBaron, M. 2001. *Conflict and Culture: A Literature Review and Bibliography.*
Revised edition. Victoria, BC: Institute for Dispute Resolution, University of Victoria.

Lundvik, U. 1982. A Brief Survey of the History of the Ombudsman. *The Ombudsman Journal* 2: 85-94.

Maezawa, T. 2003. Organization of Newspaper Ombudsmen: website publications: "Articles about Ombudsmanship". *The controversy over the origins and functions of ombudsmanship* <http://www.newsombudsmen.org/maezawa.html> (1 July 2003).

Mediate.ca, *Glossary of Dispute Resolution Term.* <http://www.mediate.ca/glossary.htm> (6 December 2002).

Morris, C., *What is "Alternative Dispute Resolution" (ADR)? Some Ways of Processing Disputes and Addressing Conflict",* 1997, revised 2002. <http://www.peacemakers.ca/publications/ADRdefinitions.html>(6 December 2002).

Nauman, A. C. 1994. Organization of Newspaper Ombudsmen: website publications: "Articles about Ombudsmanship". *News Ombudsmanship: Its History and Rationale*. <http://www.newsombudsmen.org/nauman2.html> (1 July 2003).

Olsen, J. 2001. "Conference in Riga" *Ombudsman and his role setting standards for administrative practices of the bureaucracy – or protecting the rights of the man in the street and his notion of what should be right.* Office of the Danish Parliamentary. <http://www.nmr.lv/eng/news/docs/ speech_Danish_ombudsmans_office.doc> (23 August 2002).

Office of the Investment Ombudsman "Frequently Asked Questions" *What is an Ombudsman.* <http://www.i-ombudsman.or.kr/public/faq1.html> (11 July 2003).

Online Archive of California, "Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions" *History of the Center* <http://www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/tf3s2006vg/bioghist/80872780> (28 Sep. 2003).

Pakwatan.com (2003) "Judiciary" *Wafaqi Mohtasib (Ombudsman)* http://www.pakwatan.com/main/government/judiciary.php3 (30 June 2003).

Peppiatt, D. 1997. *An Ombudsman Overview.* British Red Cross. <http://www.oneworld.org/ombudsman/OmbudP1.html> (11 September 2002).

Pickl, V. 1987. Islamic Roots of Ombudsman Systems*, 6 The Ombudsman Journal 101*.

Reif, L. C., editor. 1999. *The International Ombudsman Anthology*. Kluwer Law International M.G.J. Kimweri.

Rieger, L. "Alaska Justice Forum" *Circle Peacemaking*, 6 December 2001 <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/just/forum/f174wi01/a_circle.html> (6 December 2002).

Rowe, M. 2003. "Re: New Theory BASIC OMBUDS MODEL." 14 January 2003, personal email (11 July 2003).

Rowe, M. 2003. "Re: Fwd: Works-in-Progress" 27 June 2003, personal email (11 July 2003).

Rowe, M. 2003. "Re: Next Draft" 14 July 2003, personal email (15 July 2003).

Schimelfenig, Marriane. 1997 "letter" University of California Office of the General Counsel *Ombudsman Privilege*.

Schroeder, D. 2002. *Evolutionary Ethics.* The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosphy. <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/e/evol-eth.htm#The Place of Evolutionary Ethics in Contemporary Ethical Theory> (3 July 2003).

Schwab, H. 2003. "Helmut Schwab Writings". *The Brain, the Mind: Creativity, Ethics, Personality*. <http://www.schwab-writings.com/IntroFrameset.html> (3 July 2003)

Sebok, T. 2003. "Re: Feedback on DRAFT" 25 July 2003. Email correspondence (9 Oct. 2003)

Shelton, R.L. 2000. The Institutional Ombudsman: A University Case Study. *Negotiation Journal* 16(1): 81-98.

Steiber, C. 2000. Varieties: Has the Ombudsman Concept Become Diluted? *Negotiation Journal 16(1): 49-57*.

Stein, E. 2002. "Mitecs Fulltext." *Ethics and evolution.* <http://cognet.mit.edu/MITECS/Entry/steine> (28 August 2002).

Svantesson, P. 1999. "The Decline of the Great Power." *Charles Goes to Turkey.* <HREF="http://www.utb.boras.se/uk/se/projekt/history/articles/decline/decline6.htm"> (23 August 2002).

Swanström, K. 2001. "Presentation" *The Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman System* presented at the conference "Implementation of Ombudsman Institution in Latvia", Riga 2001-06-02.

The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition. 2000. <http://www.bartleby.com/61/7/O0070700.html> (21 August 2002).

The National Alternative Dispute Resolution Advisory Council, *Alternative Dispute Resolution Definitions*. <http://law.gov.au/aghome/advisory/nadrac/adrdefinitions.htm#anchor1105509> (6 December 2002).

The Ombudsman Association. 1985. *The Ombudsman Handbook.*

The Ombuds Association. 2001. *Code of Ethics, Standards of Practice.* <http://www.ombudstoa.org/code_of_ethics.htm> (6 September 2002).

The Victorian Ombusman. 2003. *History and Functions of the Office of the Ombudsman.* <www.ombudsman.vic.gov.au/ombd1.html> (7 July 2003).

The University Ombudsman Speech. *The Ombudsman Concept and Types of Control of Maladministration in Greece and Europe.* University of Athens, 11 November 1996 <http://www.euro-ombudsman.eu.int/speeches/en/athens1.htm> (9 September 2002).

UCSB Academic Senate, *Faculty Code of Conduct,* 1 September 1988. <http://www.senate.ucsb.edu/documents/FacCodeofConduct.html> (15 July 2003).

United States Ombudsman Association. *Model Shield Law for Ombudsman,* 18 February 1997. <(http://www.usombudsman.org/References/modelshieldlaw.htm> (4 August 2002).

University and College Ombuds Association. *Standards of Practice*. <http://www.colorado.edu/Ombuds/UCOA/SOP.html> (4 September 2002).

University and College Ombuds Association (1995) *The Ombudsman Handbook: A Practical Guide to Establishing and Operating and Ombuds Office on a College or University Campus.*

University of California, Irvine, Office of the Ombudsman. *Definition and Role* <http://www.ombuds.uci.edu/role.html > (23 Aug. 2002).

University of California, Santa Barbara, *Policy on Sexual Harassment and Complaint Resolution Procecure,* 23 December 1993. <http://ucsbuxa.ucsb.edu/sex-harass-complaints/SHpolicy.html> (15 July 2003).

Vice, J. 1994. University Ombuds Roles. *California Caucus of College and University Ombudsman UCI Ombudsman: The Journal.* <http://www.ombuds.uci.edu/JOURNALS/1994/ombuds_role.html> (15 July 2003).

Volkert, V. 2002. *Humming May Have Been the Earliest Language.* Florida State Online Times <http://www.fsu.edu/~fstime/FS-Times/volume8/nov02web/8nov02.html> (3 July 2003).

Waal, F. B. M. 1989. *Peacemaking among primates*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.1989.

Wagner, M. L. 2000. The Organizational Ombudsman as Change Agent. *Negotiation Journal* 16 (1): 99-114.

Weiner, J. , and A. Mcleod, and C. Yala. 2002. *Aspects of Conflict in the Contemporary Papau New Guinea Highlands.* The Australian National University: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies. Discussion Paper. <http://rspas.anu.edu.au/melanesia/PDF/yala02-4.pdf> (9 Oct. 2003).

Wyner, A. J. 1972. Lieutenant Governors as Political Ombudsmen. *Public Affairs Report (Bulletin of the Institute of Governmental Studies)* 12 (6) 1-6 December 1971.

Wyner, A.J., editor. 1973. *Executive Ombudsmen in the United States.* Institute of Government Studies: University of California, Berkeley-Ombudsman Activities Project Publication.